



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

authority, that these Apostles still have rule over you; but it could be easily proved that this text is not authority for either the one or the other; so you have yet to give Scripture proof of your prayers for the dead, and for holidays in honour of the saints.

I am, Sir, yours, &c., &c.,

EDMOND POWER.

The arrival of a long letter from Mr. Power has placed us in a disagreeable perplexity, between our desire to deal courteously with our correspondent and our fear of wearying the patience of our readers with further discussion on an exhausted subject. As the best mode of reconciling our duty to both, we print Mr. Power's letter in full, and at the same time, for the convenience of our readers, we portion off those parts of the subjects which have been thoroughly discussed from those which still deserve examination.

We repeat, then, that as far as the Fathers of the first three centuries are concerned, the question is settled—settled, that is, as far as any controversy can be—when both parties are agreed as to the state of the facts, and when nothing remains but a difference of opinion.

The question proposed was—"Do any writers for the first three centuries make any mention of the doctrine of Purgatory?" and it now appears that, during the many months our columns have been open for the discussion of this question, evidence has only been able to be adduced from *one* of the many writers who flourished during the first three hundred years of our religion, and that one Origen! And we are also agreed as to the fact that Origen is in general a very unsafe guide, and that he has fallen into many heresies.

We differ in opinion, in that Mr. Power holds, that in the passages cited Origen expresses views exactly coinciding with the present Roman Catholic doctrine of Purgatory, and that he was also joined in these opinions by the Church of his day; while we hold that in these passages Origen only expressed a certain heretical notion of his own, in which he was neither followed by the Church of his own day nor the Church of Rome at present.

It would be hopeless to expect that this difference of opinion could be removed by further argument; and we only appeal from Mr. Power's opinion (who, under the exigencies of controversy, is scarcely an impartial judge) to that of the most learned and candid divines of his own communion, who, we have shown, agree with us, and not with him. We think that our readers will be grateful to us for closing all further discussion on this part of the subject, except such as may be calculated to throw some new light on the state of the facts, such as other passages from the Fathers of the first three centuries, which Mr. Power professes to be able to produce, and which, of course, he ought to do, and is perfectly free to do if he can.

It would seem, then, that we ought to come next to discuss the state of the facts as to the writers of the fourth century, by whose help Mr. Power proposes to interpret Origen; but there is something which must take precedence of a question of facts, and that is a question of fundamental principles. Now, in a part of his letter, to which he has invited our especial attention, Mr. Power makes it plain that the principles on which he argues the question are wholly different from ours. He says, "Those Fathers of the fourth century whose opinions I have given, either declare the established doctrine of the Church of that period, or they wrote what was untrue." If they have given us the doctrine of the Church in their time, such doctrine must necessarily be true. If they published that which was not the doctrine of the Church at that time, why were not these false principles then, or in the next age, condemned by the Church? To this proposition I demand a direct reply."

Now, it is evident that our reply to this question must come before any discussion as to the views of particular writers of the fourth century. For suppose that we were completely successful in demolishing every passage which could be brought forward in proof of Purgatory from writers of the fourth century, Mr. Power would only have to alter the word "fourth," in the argument just cited, into "fifth," or "sixth," or "seventh," or whatever the first century may be in which he can find purgatory to have been part of the received belief among Christians. In fact, it is plain that the way Mr. Power, perhaps unconsciously, argues is—"Purgatory is part of the teaching of the Church now; the Church cannot err, and her doctrines must be always the same; therefore the statements of the Fathers of the fourth century must be interpreted so as to coincide with the teaching of the Church now, and the statements of Origen, so as to coincide with those of the Fathers of the fourth century."

Now, when Mr. Power says—"Either these Fathers declare the established doctrine of the Church of that period, or they wrote what was untrue."† We object to his state-

ment for two reasons; first, he assumes that the established doctrine of the Church is always the same, which is denied, not only by Protestants, but also by Mr. Newman, and the other Roman Catholics who hold the doctrine of development; and, secondly, he assumes that the received belief of the majority of Christians is in every point true, which is denied by Protestants. Now, no one is at liberty to assume, in controversy, first principles denied by his opponent, otherwise the controversy falls to the ground at once. If Mr. Power were at liberty to assume that the Church of Rome is infallible, then it would be needless for him to spend his time in collecting the opinion of the Fathers about Purgatory; he might content himself with saying it is the doctrine of the Church now—that is enough. On the other hand, if we were at liberty to assume the principle of the sufficiency of Scripture, we need not appeal to the Fathers; we might say there is nothing about Purgatory in the Bible—that is enough. But there is a neutral ground on which we can meet Mr. Power, and that is, to treat the matter as a purely historical question. Without assuming the doctrinal point that the writers of the first three centuries must have believed exactly as those of the tenth century, can you ascertain from their own writings whether they believed in Purgatory or not? Can you connect, by historical evidence, Purgatory with the teaching of the Apostles, and can you show that those who learned from them held that doctrine? We have ascertained, in the course of this discussion, that if they believed in Purgatory, at least in all their writings, they said nothing about it; and that though there were many occasions when we might expect them to have mentioned it. There is a great gap, then, between the Apostolic teaching and the first mention of Purgatory—a gap which nothing but the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church can ever bridge over.

Having laid down these principles, we have a clear way to enter next month on the examination of the views of subsequent writers, it being understood that no testimony from the fourth century can make up for the want of earlier evidence—that we are not at liberty to assume it to be impossible that Gregory of Nyssa, or Basil ever could have fallen into error on any point; and that if Mr. Power can even succeed in proving that the Fathers of the fourth century believed exactly the same as Origen, we are free to reply, "so much the worse for the Fathers of the fourth century."

The same principles enable us to dispose of the challenge which Mr. Power repeats as to Origen, whom he says we have left untouched. Mr. Power's mistake is, that he imagines the *onus probandi* to be on us to show that the passages cited from Origen have been formally condemned; whereas, in truth, it is incumbent on him to show that the sentiments there expressed are those of the church of the time, before he can prove that Purgatory was the belief of the third century. The principle assumed by Mr. Power is, that every sentence in Origen must be understood to be in accordance with the doctrine of the Church, unless it can be shown that that particular sentence has been formally condemned. It would be untrue to assume this in the case of any one of the fathers, but it is perfectly monstrous to assume it of Origen.* Does Mr. Power imagine that there was a "Congregation of the Index" in those days, who went over the works of every eminent Christian writer, expurgating all the faulty passages, and leaving nothing but what might be safely followed by posterity? One would fancy that he must entertain some such belief, from his so often asking us either to receive the doctrine held by such and such a father, or else to show where this sentence was condemned by his successors. At all events, concerning Origen, the hero of a hundred heresies, it is enough to say that, with regard to any exposition taken at random from his works, the odds are that it is *not* in accordance with the general opinion of the church; and any one who asserts the contrary is bound to prove it.

We must not conclude without some remarks on the other subject which Mr. Power has introduced into this discussion—the necessity for a Scripture proof for church holidays, &c.; because it is an example how ignorant even educated Roman Catholics are as to the first principles of Protestants—ignorance which we hope this journal has already done some good in removing.

Protestants hold, then, that our Lord by his own mouth, and those of his apostles, revealed to the world certain truths which it deeply concerned mankind to know; and that in order that this revelation should not be lost, it was committed to writing in what are commonly known as the "Holy Scriptures." For any thing which claims to be part of this system of truth, the knowledge of which is necessary to men's salvation, they accordingly require Scripture proof.

But they hold, likewise, that our Lord formed his disciples into a society, having full powers to make regulations for its preservation and for the details of its worship, &c.; and for details of this nature they do *not* require Scriptural proof.

If any one asks us why do we religiously observe the festival of Christmas Day, or why do we make use in our pub-

* For clearness we omit in this argument the word heretical, added here by Mr. Power, the word being ambiguous. The word heresy is sometimes used to denote any grave doctrinal error; sometimes such an error as was condemned by the majority of Christians at the time when it originated. It is plain that it would be a contradiction in terms to speak of the majority of Christians as falling into heresy in the latter sense, though not in the former; and thus the word may be so used as to prejudice the great question at issue between Roman Catholics and Protestants—viz., was it possible for the majority of Christians at any time to fall into serious error on religious subjects.

† This phrase "established doctrine of the Church," being also ambiguous, it is necessary to remark that it is not pretended that the

Church had established anything in the first thousand years by *any formal decision* upon Purgatory; and the question only is whether it was the *received belief of the majority of Christians*.

* The passages from Origen, which Mr. Power quotes, have been already the subject of much discussion. Not to occupy space unnecessarily, we think it enough to refer the reader to Vol. i., p. 67, 142, and Vol. ii., p. 67.

WHAT IS THE POSITION OF THE PRIEST IN THE MASS?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have observed in your journal many remarks, at both sides, of considerable ability, on the Roman Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the Sacrifice of the Mass. Such vital topics demand the most careful discussion. Both parties should distinctly comprehend the propositions for or against which they contend. Many of them have been clearly stated, and ably defended by your Roman Catholic correspondents. I am in hopes, therefore, they will explain to me their views on one of the most momentous nature, and as yet untouched by either. We know enough of the disputed change in the eucharistic elements; we know that the same propitiatory sacrifice is said to be there offered up that took place on the Cross of Calvary; but we do not yet know what exact position the priest who accomplishes these sacred mysteries is supposed to occupy. If that which I am about to state be really the doctrine of their church, it will be an additional obstacle to adopting their belief. If, on the other hand, it be shown not to be so, it will be a serious obstacle removed. It is, therefore, well worth their while to grapple with the subject.

The short question is this—is the priest, in the administration of this sacrament, supposed to take on himself the "person, power, and functions" of our Lord Jesus Christ? If he be so, we must require strong proof of so startling a proposition—blasphemous if falsely put forward—and if he be not, I must ask for an explanation of the following passages in the Catechism of the Council of Trent:—

"* The Sacrifice of the Mass is one and the same sacrifice with that of the Cross; the victim is still one and the same, Jesus Christ. * * * * The priest is also the same Christ our Lord; the ministers who offer this sacrifice consecrate the holy mysteries *not in their own, BUT IN THE PERSON OF CHRIST*. This, the words of consecration declare; the priest does not say—"This is the body of Christ," but, this is *my* body; and thus invested with the character of Christ, he changes the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of his real body and blood."

But this may be a solitary expression, not meant to convey so strong a meaning as at first sight it bears. Yet it is strange that a few pages afterwards,† in speaking of the power of the priest in the Sacrament of Penance, it says—"The voice of the priest, who is legitimately constituted a minister for the remission of sins, is to be heard as that of Christ himself, who said to the lame man—"Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee."

Lest we should give this or the preceding passage a figurative turn, we meet, a few pages further on, language that seems scarcely capable of being equivocal—"In the minister of God, who sits in the tribunal of penance as his legitimate judge, he (the penitent) venerates the *power and person* of our Lord Jesus Christ; for, in the administration of this, *as in that of the other sacraments*, the priest represents the character, and discharges the functions of Jesus Christ."

I ask your correspondents to consider these three passages together, and say what power is attributed to the priest, or what is wanting to his actual deification—I mean, during, and with reference to, his celebration of these sacraments. I shall reserve my remarks—if remarks be needed on such a result—till I find whether or not the plain interpretation be that of the Roman Catholic belief. If it be, I should like to see some attempt at supporting its truth; if it be not, I should remind them that the doctrine of Transubstantiation has affected to be founded on a *literal* interpretation of some texts of Scripture. In a former letter I think I have shown that this supposition is utterly mistaken. In a future I may have to observe that their official explanations of this Sacrament cannot be credited by good Roman Catholics, unless when softened and diluted by a very *figurative* interpretation.

FONTIUM PETITOR.

THE BLESSED VIRGIN AND THE HOLY GHOST.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I fear that Pat's report of the sermon in which the shocking statement was made, that the Blessed Virgin was the wife of the Holy Ghost, must have been but too true, for we find the same sort of thing affirmed, not only in Dr.

* Translated by the Rev. J. Donovan, Professor of the Royal College of Maynooth. Coyne, Dublin, 1829; p. 249.
† Page 256.

Marshall's sermon in Ireland, but in books published by authority on the Continent. I will refer your readers to a book, used in the year 1851, in a mission for the benefit of Malaga in the south of Spain, by Father Felix of Cadiz, and reprinted, with grant of indulgences, &c., by licence of Salvador Tonf, then Bishop of Malaga, now Archbishop of Granada. It is called "Novena of the Most Holy Mary, under the title of the Divine Shepherdess of Souls, Protectress of the Mission of the Capuchin Order." It consists of nine supposed offices of the Blessed Virgin in the character of Divine Shepherdess, with a meditation upon each office and a prayer. The title of Divine Shepherdess was first invented in the year 1703. Her nine offices as Shepherdess are:—1. Knowing the sheep. 2. Leading the sheep. 3. Driving away the wolves with her voice and crook. 4. Encouraging the feeble sheep. 5. Healing the sick sheep. 6. Seeking for the lost sheep. 7. Bringing back the lost sheep to the fold. 8. Assisting the sheep at their death. 9. Being an example to the sheep.

The reason why, if all this is true, our Lord speaks of himself as the Shepherd, instead of his mother as the Shepherdess, we need not here inquire, but yet it is worth knowing. To come to the point of this letter, there are appended to this Novena the Seven Mysteries of Joy, the Seven Mysteries of Sorrow, and the Seven Mysteries of Glory. The last of the Mysteries of Glory is as follows:—

"The Holy Ghost enamoured, boasts himself (Blasona) a faithful lover; burning with the flames of love, he crowns thee as his bride. It is assuredly a garland due to thee, for thou werst the most brilliant Shepherdess."

"R. Since thou art my Shepherdess, I am thy sheep—Ave Maria!"

Your obedient servant,

M.

PERSECUTION IN HINDOSTAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR.—There are very many promises in the Scripture addressed to the afflicted and persecuted people of God, but referring generally to the spiritual consolations to be imparted to them here, or the joys laid up for them hereafter. In one passage, however (Mark x. 29), our Lord expressly says, that those who have suffered the loss of all for his sake shall have "one hundred fold more in this present life" than they have lost. Are we to understand this literally? I think that the following anecdote may be an interesting and instructive reply to the question—interesting, as showing how a poor Hindoo convert understood it; and instructive, as holding up an example which we, who may think ourselves more advanced in the Christian life than a convert from heathenism could be, would do well to follow. The person referred to was a Brahmin, by name Dhondapa; he, with two others, were the first converts in Western India, and were baptized in the year 1825. He was sorely persecuted, almost to death. There was so much bitterness against him, that the missionary, who was the means, under God, of his conversion, feared to baptize him in his native place, but took him to Bombay, a considerable distance, for the purpose. After his baptism he returned home, but there he was an outcast. By the Hindoo law he was considered dead, and his house and land were transferred to another. His wife and children were taken from him, his relations despised and persecuted him, and none of his own people would assist him in any way. His wife was especially bitter against him, called him a devil, would not speak to him, or even walk at the same side of the road with him. The Lord raised him up friends among the Europeans. Being a Brahmin, he had never learned any trade, but he could write a little, and a Christian gentleman gave him some employment in that way, and supported him. After some years, when this friend was removed by death, another was raised up, and thus he was not suffered to want. It was during his residence with the latter friend that the little circumstance referred to took place; this was several years after his conversion, and it is worthy of remark, that at this time he sent more than half of the small sum which he received monthly for his own support to his heathen wife. Her enmity against him was no way abated, but she was in poverty and distress, and Dhondapa nobly acted out his dear Lord's precept— "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them which hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you." In the family with whom Dhondapa was living, the Scriptures were daily read, in the Mahratta language, to the heathen servants. Dhondapa was always present, with his Mahratta Testament, and was ready to say a word, when called upon, or reply to a question. In the course of reading, the 10th chapter of St. Mark's Gospel came under consideration, and after various questions had been asked of the listeners, to ascertain how far they understood what was read, and some remarks had been made, Dhondapa was thus appealed to—"Well, Dhondapa, this is a remarkable verse, in which the Lord Jesus says that he will give 'an hundred-fold more in this present life' to those who have forsaken all for him. You *know*, forsaken all—*you* have lost wife and children, house and lands; can *you say* that the Lord Jesus has given you a hundred-fold more in this world, according

to his promise here?" Dhondapa replied immediately, with great simplicity, to the effect, that it was true that he had given up all that he had for the religion of Jesus Christ, and that he had suffered much in body and mind—that great anger had been felt towards him by his family, who had cast him from them; but God, he said, had been very good to him, giving him great joy and peace in his own mind, and also giving him fathers, and mothers, and children (referring to the friends raised up to him); "Father and mother" is the common Hindoo appellation for a protecting friend) in place of those whom he had lost since he believed on Jesus Christ, and then he paused, and added emphatically—"He says He gives an hundred-fold, but I think He gives a thousand-fold!" Was not this a striking testimony to the truth of God's promises, as well as to the simple, thankful spirit of the poor convert? and ought it not to be a lesson to us who have so many mercies—mercies to our land, mercies to our people, mercies to our families—more than the poor Hindoo? Made, too, as it was, before several heathen servants, for Dhondapa was not ashamed to confess Christ before men, one would have thought that it would have come home to their hearts (for the persecution to which they are exposed, when they profess Christ, is a great hindrance to many poor Hindoos), and have been a word of encouragement, especially to one among them, who knew the truth, but feared to "follow on to know the Lord"; but it seemed to make no impression, for until the Lord is pleased to work by his spirit, however the head may be taught, the heart remains unmoved. This is alike true, of all men, whether nominally Christian or not: our Lord teaches us that the state of the nominal Christian may be even worse than that of the heathen.—Matt. xi. 22. Perhaps another little circumstance regarding Dhondapa may be interesting, and likewise convey another lesson to us. The prophetic books of the Old Testament were not translated into the Mahratta language until some time after the New Testament, and the Pentateuch had been, and it was near twenty years after Dhondapa's conversion that he first saw the Book of the Prophet Isaiah, the first of the Prophets that was printed. A friend brought it to him from Bombay; he was greatly delighted with it, and read it through with great eagerness; he could hardly bear to lay down the book until he had finished it. "Oh!" he said; "these are sweet words, this is all *very good*, this is the *Gospel*;" and he determined to learn the book by heart. He had received the Pilgrim's Progress before this, and was very fond of reading it; but one passage puzzled him: he thought that it differed from the Scriptures. He was a very simple-minded man—it was not always easy either to make out his difficulties or to remove them. When a text from the Holy Scriptures could be brought to clear up a passage, or make a duty plain, that satisfied him. In this instance, the friend who tried in vain to remove his difficulty, with regard to the Pilgrim's Progress, at last said—"Well, Dhondapa, if you cannot understand this seeming difference, remember that the Scriptures are the Word of God, while the Pilgrim's Progress is only the word of man." "The word of man!" exclaimed Dhondapa, "the word of man! I thought that it had been the Word of God. I shall put it away—I do not want the word of man, I want only the Word of God!" He could say with the Psalmist—"The entrance of thy word giveth light, it giveth understanding unto the simple; oh, how love I thy law! It is my meditation all the day." May this be our happy experience; and may we be enabled also to pray, "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law."

AN EYE-WITNESS.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR SEPTEMBER.

(From the *Irish Farmers' Gazette*.)

THE general ripening of the grain crops being unusually late, by from ten days to a fortnight later than the generality of seasons, renders the farming operations given in our last still appropriate, and harvest operations will, therefore, constitute the chief employment during this month; and from the very uneven and scattered way in which the grain is ripening, will most probably be extended far into the next. Much alarm has arisen during the last fortnight from an anticipated scarcity of hands in cutting and gathering in the harvest, but this is subsiding in some degree, as the men are now fast returning from the English harvest; and as our harvest is not coming in so general or so quick as hitherto, there is but little to fear, in a general way, either from a scarcity of hands, or a higher rate of wages than the farmer is able to pay. With those who may be differently circumstanced, reaping by the scythe must be adopted, at least, in part, which, if carefully performed, will be equally effective with the reaping-hook or sickle, particularly with oats if not allowed to get too ripe. Cutting with the scythe, even with some trifling drawbacks, has particular advantages, which go far in compensation; some of which are—a greater quantity of straw, from the closeness to the ground with which the scythe cuts; and this alone will be of paramount advantage, by giving an increase of fodder, as hay is now both scarce and dear; the corn will cure much sooner after the scythe than the sickle, and can, therefore, be carried

and stacked much earlier, thus saving much loss of grain from handling, and also of time.

General Observations.—Avoid as much as possible cutting corn of any kind during rain or while wet, embracing every dry opportunity for that purpose; and immediately as it is cut, let it be bound in very small sheaves, and stooked. If the weather be dry, and can be depended on, laying in swathe ungathered till next day will expedite its curing, and dry up any green herbage that may be cut with the corn. Let it not be capped or hooded till towards evening, or on the approach of rain; and in stooking or field stacking, avoid making either near hedges or trees, keeping them out in the open field, exposed to free air on all sides. As it will be of paramount importance to subject the stubble to the operations of the grubber or the plough, as early as possible after the severance of the crop, let the stocks be made in straight lines, at wide intervals, so that if any delay arises in carrying home the crop; those implements may have room to work while the weather is yet dry, and the land dry and friable.

Stacking.—When fit to be carried, make the stacks with a long shank and a short head, to save thatching; ventilate those by carrying up one or more perpendicular chimneys, which should discharge into horizontal flues, open at both ends, under the eaves, and, as soon as completed, let the stack be immediately thatched.

Ploughing is an operation that no other work should be allowed to interfere with, and should be proceeded with immediately after the severance of the corn. The stubble and annual weeds, by being now ploughed down, will be converted into the richest vegetable manure, and the earth, being laid up high and dry during the winter, will be ameliorated by the influence of alternate frosts and thaws, the inorganic materials broken down and disengaged, and the ammonia absorbed from the atmosphere, which is always charged abundantly with it, the action of the harrows or grubbers, on the first dry weather in spring, will reduce the surface to the finest possible tilth. Where the land requires subsoiling, this is the best, easiest, and most profitable period to effect it, as it will have longer time to lie under the fertilizing effects of the weather. In lieu of subsoil plough, a common plough, stripped of its mould-board, following in the track of the first, will do this work very efficiently; or it may be done by manual labour, by disposing six or eight men along the track of the plough, according to the speed of the horses, with good strong spades, to dig eight to ten inches deep under the depth of the plough, and throw the subsoil, if it be good, on top of that raised by the plough; or, if not of a quality to bring to the surface, turn it over to that depth in the bottom of the furrow. Before this operation is attempted, it must be understood that the land is either naturally dry, or rendered so by draining. The latter cannot be profitably effected if subsoiling do not follow.

Winter Vetches should be sown this month in breadth, according to requirements. Mixed with rye or oats it comes into use earlier than when sown alone. Four bushels of winter vetches, mixed with four or five stone of rye to the Irish acre, will give the earliest cutting; the same quantity of vetches and oats comes in next; while a breadth sown at same time of unmixed vetches, will only be in its prime when the others are nearly consumed. Three or four lbs. of rape per Irish acre, sown at same time, will materially increase the bulk of provender, and keep the vetches from lying on the ground. In dry land the crop may be sown on the flat, but in land having a tendency to damp, ridges with open furrows will be best; a liberal dressing of manure will vastly increase the weight of crop.

Rape, sown in June last, should now be planted out, the earlier the better, and may still be sown on dry, warm soils, with a favourable aspect; but in cold, backward ones it is too late to sow, though transplanting may be proceeded with, both this and the next month.

Italian Rye-grass and **Clover**, for soiling early next season, should be sown this month, the earlier the better, in well-prepared, clean, rich, stubble land, after green-crops, or after early potatoes. It will come into use early in May; in some cases it will be fit for cutting some time in April, and with the assistance of liquid-manure or rich compost after cutting, yield several cuttings during the season.

Clover and Grass-seeds, intended for either meadow or permanent pastures, should now be sown; in either cases three or four lbs. of rape to the Irish acre should be sown; it will give shelter to the tender grasses, and afford a nutritious bite to sheep early in the spring, when it should be eaten down.

Wheat, on fallow lands, or after early potatoes, should be sown this month, if the land be sufficiently moist; if not, time must be given for a fall of rain, and the seed committed to the ground, when it is neither too wet nor too dry.

Bere should be sown as early as possible in dry, light, rich soil; it comes in early before the general harvest, and affords a plentiful supply of bread corn for home consumption, at a most critical time, when provisions are both scarce and dear.

Winter Dun Oats have now become one of our best established and most profitable autumn-sown grain crops, and, in many instances, has superseded wheat. It comes in early, is perfectly hardy, and yields abundantly; but it should be sown early, and the soil tolerably dry at the period of sowing, to insure success.